REMARKS AND ELECTION

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office action mailed May 20, 2004, the Examiner classified the Applicant's invention as two distinct inventions and restricted the Applicant to one of the following two groups of claims, of which:

Group 1 is Claims 1-5 and 9-17, drawn to "... board to board routing with SNMP...", classified in class 709, subclass 238; and

Group 2 is Claims 6-8, drawn to "...downloading a software image...", classified in class 717, subclass 178.

2. Status of Claims

Presently pending in this application are claims 1-17 of which claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14, 16, and 17 are independent and the remainder are dependent.

3. Explanation of Amendments

In the specification, the paragraph beginning on page 4, line 17 was amended to indicate that the processor may also *receive commands* addressed to multiple boards and *routes the commands* to the multiple destinations instead of "receive command" and "routes the boards." Support for this amendment is located in the specification on page 2, lines 3-5, where the Applicant indicates the present invention specifically relates *to routing commands to different destinations* within a computer system. Additional support for this amendment is claim 10. No new material was added to the specification by this amendment.

Also, in the specification, the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 3, was

amended to show that "the command may be routed to the board" instead of "the board may be routed to the board." Support for this amendment is at step 412 in Figure 4 of the drawings, where step 412 states "Route command." Additional support for this amendment is located in the specification on page 13, lines 3-5, where the Applicant states "the system may *route the command to the proper board.* For example, if the command has a Destination of board 3 in chassis 1, then the system *routes the command to board* 3 in chassis 1." No new material was added to the specification by this amendment.

In the claims, claim 10 was amended to indicate that the system manager of claim 9 wherein the processor receives commands addressed to multiple boards and *routes the commands* to the multiple destinations, instead of "routes the boards." Support for this amendment is located in the specification on page 2, lines 3-5 and on page 5, lines 8-15. No new material was added to the specification by this amendment.

4.   Election

In compliance with M.P.E.P Section 818, the Applicant elects claims 1-5 and 9-17 of group I without prejudice. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of Claims 6-8 in a divisional application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 7, 2004

By Robert J. Irvine
Reg. No. 41,865